1	APPEARANCES:	
2	For the Petitioner:	ALEXANDRIA SCARBROUGH FISHER Frost Brown Todd
3 4		150 Third Avenue South Suite 1900 Nashville, TN 37201
5		
6		
7	For the Respondent:	JOEL HUGH SANDERSON Monarch Immigration Rights
8		Advocates 5252 Hickory Hollow Parkway
9		Suite 270A Antioch, TN 37013
10		
11	Interpreters:	Heather Hayes
12		Judith Kristy
13		
14		INDEX
15	Petitioner's witnesses	
16	ELANA VASQUEZ	
17	Rebuttal Direct Examination By Ms. Fisher8 Rebuttal Cross-Examination By Mr. Sanderson9	
18	Reductal Closs-Examilia	cion by Mr. Sanderson
19	Respondent's witness	
20	PAOLA GAMBA	
21	Rebuttal Direct Examination By Mr. Sanderson11	
22	Continued Rebuttal Direct Examination By Mr. Sanders@@Rebuttal Cross-Examination By Ms. Fisher34 Rebuttal Redirect Examination By Mr. Sanderson43 Rebuttal Recross-Examination By Ms. Fisher46	
23		
24	Rebuttal Redirect Exam	ination By Mr. Sanderson47 nation By Ms. Fisher49
25	MEDUCCAL MECIOSS-EXAMIL	nacton by ha. Etaner43

1	LAURA VANESSA OQUENDO RUIZ
2	Direct Examination By Mr. Sanderson
3	Reductal Closs Examination by Ms. Fisher
4	Petitioner's witness
5	EDISON VAZQUEZ CARVAJAL
6	Surrebuttal Direct Examination By Ms. Fisher50 Surrebuttal Cross-Examination By Mr. Sanderson53.
7	
9	EXHIBITS
10	Petitioner No. 16Collective exhibit of emails .35 between respondent and Luz Elena Villegas
11 12	Sanchez Petitioner No. 17Screenshots of What's App36 conversations
13	Respondent No. 12Lawyers 201819
14	Administrative requirements to obtain an academic title Respondent No. 13Tax assessment records from25
15	respondent's mom and dad's house Respondent No. 14Photographs of clothing worn .28
16 17	by petitioner Respondent No. 15Email response from30 respondent to US Department of State
18	(Response to Exhibit 8 email)
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1

2

3

4

5

The above-styled cause came to be heard on March 27, 2018, before the Hon. Aleta A. Trauger, District Judge, when the following proceedings were had at 9:37 a.m. to-wit:

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

25

THE COURT: Good morning. Let's swear the interpreters.

9 (Interpreters sworn.)

> THE COURT: All right. We are here in hopefully our last chapter of this Hague Convention case of Edison Carvajal versus Paola Gamba. We have Alex Fisher for the petitioner. We have Joel Sanderson for the respondent. The petitioner is on the phone; is that correct, Ms. Fisher?

> > MS. FISHER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. FISHER: To the best of my

understanding right now.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Carvajal, are you there on the phone? Mr. Carvajal?

MR. CARVAJAL: Yes, it's me here.

THE COURT: Okay. And Ms. Gamba, the

2.4 respondent, is here in the courtroom.

And we have an interpreter from the

respondent's lawyer's law firm interpreting for her, 1 Jama Reinhardt. 3 So my memory is that we had additional 4 rebuttal from the petitioner, which was going to 5 consist only of additional testimony from 6 Mr. Carvajal. And then we were going to have rebuttal 7 from the respondent. Is that correct, Ms. Fisher? 8 MS. FISHER: Your Honor, I'd like to 9 reserve the right to call Mr. Carvajal. At this time 10 I don't know if he'll be needed. 11 THE COURT: Okay. 12 MS. FISHER: I'd like to reserve that 13 right. 14 THE COURT: Okay. And you are going to 15 call the petitioner -- the respondent? 16 MR. SANDERSON: I'm going to call the 17 petitioner, and then I have one piece of evidence --18 THE COURT: You're going to call the 19 respondent, not the petitioner. 2.0 MR. SANDERSON: Yes, respondent. And 2.1 then I have one piece of evidence that an attorney 22 from Colombia, we would call him just to authenticate 23 that piece of evidence and how that was obtained. 2.4 THE COURT: Okay. All right. 25 MS. FISHER: And, Your Honor, I

apologize. I would like to reserve the right to call potentially one more additional witness who would be Elana Vasquez, Mr. Carvajal's mother, just for a brief line of questioning.

2.0

2.1

2.4

THE COURT: All right. We had the petitioner's rebuttal witnesses at our last hearing. We had Ana Vasquez. We had Diana Vasquez. Then we had Mr. Carvajal. And then we had Luz Villegas. And you are saying that you do not wish to call Mr. Carvajal now during your rebuttal? Because we are still in your rebuttal.

MS. FISHER: Yes, Your Honor. I'd like to reserve the right to call him later if needed.

THE COURT: Well, we're not going to back and forth forever.

MS. FISHER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So we are in your rebuttal now, and I will consider whether or not I will let you put him on after the rebuttal of the respondent because we cannot just continue to go back and forth and have everyone giving testimony.

MS. FISHER: Absolutely, Your Honor. The reason I would like to reserve his potential rebuttal testimony is because I don't know what the testimony is going to be from the attorney who might be

1 testifying in Colombia. 2 THE COURT: Okay. 3 MS. FISHER: If you would like me to go 4 ahead and put on his mother, Elana Vasquez, I should 5 have just three questions for her based on some 6 testimony that came up in the transcript since the 7 time she testified on February 21. 8 THE COURT: Okay. That will be fine. 9 MS. FISHER: Okay. 10 THE COURT: But since there is new 11 evidence that will be coming in on rebuttal from the 12 respondent, I will allow you surrebuttal, but only on 13 that new evidence. 14 MS. FISHER: Absolutely. 15 THE COURT: Not on whatever the 16 respondent says. 17 Okay. So let's have your additional rebuttal testimony. 18 19 MS. FISHER: Yes, Your Honor. I'd like 2.0 to call Elana Vasquez. Ms. Vasquez, if you're on the 2.1 phone, if you could please go ahead and unmute. 22 THE COURT: Ms. Vasquez, are you on the 2.3 phone? 2.4 THE WITNESS: Yes, here I am. 25 THE COURT: All right. Let's swear the

1 witness. ELANA VASQUEZ called as a witness, after having been first duly 3 4 sworn, testified as follows: 5 THE WITNESS: I do, and (unintelligible). 6 THE INTERPRETER: Would Your Honor like 7 the interpreter to inquire? 8 THE COURT: Yes. THE WITNESS: I do. And we are in the 9 10 greatest week of love and companionship. 11 THE COURT: Ask a question, please. 12 REBUTTAL DIRECT EXAMINATION 13 BY MS. FISHER: 14 Ms. Vasquez, did you help care of Thiago Q. 15 when Thiago lived in Colombia? 16 Α. Yes, frequently. 17 How often did you help take care of 18 Thiago? 19 Every weekend. Α. 2.0 THE INTERPRETER: One moment, Your Honor, 2.1 the interpreter would like to inquire. 22 THE WITNESS: Every weekend. 23 BY MS. FISHER: 2.4 To the best of your knowledge do you know 25 if Edison intended to move to the United States

1 permanently? Α. It was never in his plans. 3 Ο. To the best of your knowledge, do you 4 know if Edison consented to Thiago remaining 5 permanently in the United States? 6 He didn't permit it, nor would he. 7 MS. FISHER: That's all at this time, 8 Your Honor. 9 Okay, thank you. Now, we're THE COURT: 10 ready for the rebuttal testimony of the respondent. 11 MS. FISHER: Mr. Sanderson may want to 12 cross-examine. 13 THE COURT: Excuse me? 14 MR. SANDERSON: Yeah, I'd like to ask her 15 just a couple questions. 16 THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry. 17 REBUTTAL CROSS-EXAMINATION 18 BY MR. SANDERSON: 19 Hi, Ms. Vasquez. This is Joel Sanderson, 2.0 the attorney for Ms. Gamba. 2.1 Very good day to you. How are you? Α. 22 Doing well, thanks. You testified just 2.3 now that you cared for Thiago on the weekends. 2.4 were you and where was Thiago when you were caring for

25

him?

1 Α. At my house. Ο. So on the weekends Thiago was usually over at your house? 3 4 Normally on weekends -- can I say 5 something else? 6 I have an additional question, 7 Ms. Vasquez. So before Ms. Gamba came to the 8 United States, did you know that Ms. Gamba wanted to 9 move to the United States? 10 I got very sad at the moment that I 11 realized that she was abandoning her little child. 12 THE COURT: That was not the question. 13 Ask the question again. This is the Judge speaking. 14 BY MR. SANDERSON: 15 Before Ms. Gamba came to the Ο. 16 United States, did you know that she wanted to move to 17 the United States? 18 I was not up to date on her plans. 19 MR. SANDERSON: No more questions, 2.0 Your Honor. 2.1 THE COURT: Any redirect? 22 MS. FISHER: No, Your Honor. 2.3 THE COURT: All right. Now we will go 2.4 to -- thank you, Ms. Vasquez. Let me ask, is your son 25 with you at the moment?

1 THE WITNESS: Yes, he's here with me. THE COURT: Okay. 3 All right. Mr. Sanderson, we're ready 4 for the respondent's rebuttal. 5 MR. SANDERSON: Your Honor, the attorney 6 is having trouble connecting to the system. I can go 7 ahead and put on Ms. Gamba. 8 THE COURT: Okav. 9 PAOLA GAMBA 10 called as a witness, after having been first duly 11 sworn, testified as follows: 12 REBUTTAL DIRECT EXAMINATION 13 BY MR. SANDERSON: 14 Ms. Gamba, I'm going to first ask you Q. 15 some questions about the abuse that you testified about before. 16 17 Α. Okay. 18 Now, before you testified an incident 19 about -- about an incident where Mr. Carvajal used 2.0 your hands and wrists to choke you around the neck. 2.1 Α. Yes. 22 Were there any other incidents where you 2.3 ended up feeling as though you were being choked 2.4 around the neck? 25 Α. Yes.

1 Q. What happened? Α. On his niece's Angela's birthday, he took 3 my child from me, said he was going to take him. 4 hit me and since his sister got into it also, he hit 5 her. He ended up hitting both of us. 6 And where did that occur? 7 Α. That happened in San Andre when we were 8 celebrating his niece's birthday. 9 Q. And approximately when did that happen? 10 Α. It happened in April 2016. 11 Q. And were there any other incidences where you were either choked or hit? 12 13 Α. Yes. 14 Can you describe another incident? Q. 15 Α. At my house. 16 Ο. What happened? 17 He arrived drunk looking for sex. Α. Since 18 I didn't give in, he tried to choke me. 19 Ο. And what happened next? I had to call my parents. 2.0 Α. 2.1 And what did your parents do? Q. 22 Α. They helped me. They separated me from 23 him. 2.4 And are there other incidences that you 0. 25 haven't described here or in your previous testimony?

- A. There were many incidents.
 - Q. Okay. That's all I'm going to ask about the abuse. I now am going to ask about Mr. Carvajal's witness, Diana Vasquez.
 - A. Okay.
 - Q. When you lived in Colombia, did you ever meet Ms. Vasquez?
 - A. I saw her once.
 - Q. And where did you see her?
- 10 A. I saw her at a property where I had taken
 11 my son for him to meet her.
- 12 Q. And was anybody else there?
- 13 A. Yes.
- Q. And why were they there?
- 15 A. They were there because Diana had come 16 from Canada for a visit. It hadn't been too long. 17 And since she doesn't get to Colombia very much, they 18 like to get the whole family together.
- 19 Q. So how many people were there?
- A. Oh, I don't know, a lot. Maybe 40.
- 21 Lots.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- Q. When you lived in Colombia, were you close to Ms. Vasquez?
- A. No, because she lives in Canada. I just saw her the one time.

1 Q. And did you ever start communicating with her more? 3 Α. Yes. 4 Ο. When was that? 5 When I got to the United States. Α. 6 Ο. And how did you end up communicating with 7 her once you were in the United States? 8 THE INTERPRETER: May the interpreter ask 9 for a clarification from counsel. 10 MR. SANDERSON: Yes, not the manner, 11 the -- like what caused you to become --12 THE INTERPRETER: Thank you. 13 THE WITNESS: She got in touch with me 14 because she had been through that whole immigration 15 process, the same as my process. And he asked --16 Edison asked her to get in touch with me. 17 BY MR. SANDERSON: 18 Okay. And then about -- I want to ask a 19 couple questions about Ana Maria Vasquez. 2.0 Α. Fine. 2.1 When you lived in Colombia, how well did Ο. 22 you know her? 23 No, I didn't know her very well. Α. 2.4 FROM THE PHONE: Good morning. 25 MR. SANDERSON: Could you ask her to put

1 it on mute? 2 FROM THE PHONE: Okay. 3 THE COURT: What are we hearing in the 4 background? 5 MR. SANDERSON: I believe she's at work. 6 THE COURT: Who is at work? 7 This is an attorney from MR. SANDERSON: 8 Colombia. She just obtained one document for us. 9 THE COURT: Okay. Well, ask her to put 10 her phone on mute at the moment. 11 MR. SANDERSON: Ms. -- you don't need to 12 respond to this, but to let you know, it's going to be 13 just a few minutes until you are going to testify. 14 THE COURT: Mr. Sanderson, if your 15 examination of your client is going to be lengthy, we 16 could interrupt it. We do have -- in the interest of 17 time. 18 It's not going to be MR. SANDERSON: 19 particularly lengthy. I don't have that much more, 2.0 but I -- I suspect that the cross may be a little 2.1 while, so I'd be happy to just go over this real 22 quick. 2.3 THE COURT: Yeah. Would that be all 2.4 right with you, Ms. Fisher? 25 MS. FISHER: Yes, Your Honor, that's

1 fine. THE COURT: You can stay where you are, 3 Ms. Gamba. And we're going to interrupt the testimony 4 of the respondent, Ms. Gamba, in order to take this 5 additional witness. She is in Colombia and she's a lawyer and I'm sure she's very busy. And so we will 6 7 go ahead and take her testimony now. So if you would 8 take your phone off mute, we will swear you in and 9 take your testimony at this time. 10 LAURA VANESSA OQUENDO RUIZ 11 called as a witness, after having been first duly 12 sworn, testified as follows: 13 DIRECT EXAMINATION 14 BY MR. SANDERSON: 15 Ms. Oquendo, I just handed the Judge a Q. 16 copy of --17 THE COURT: Can we have her full name? 18 haven't gotten her name. 19 Sorry, Your Honor. MR. SANDERSON: 2.0 you state your name for the Court? 2.1 THE COURT: What is her name? 22 THE WITNESS: Yes, my name is Laura 2.3 Vanessa Oquendo Ruiz. 2.4 BY MR. SANDERSON: 25 And what is your profession? 0.

1 Α. I'm an attorney. Ο. And where are you an attorney? Since the 5th of March of 2018 I'm 3 Α. 4 working in the judicial branch as a scribe. 5 THE INTERPRETER: Could be a notary. 6 THE WITNESS: In Antioquia. The Second 7 Judicial District of Antioquia in the criminal trial 8 system. 9 BY MR. SANDERSON: 10 Ms. Oquendo, you provided a letter to Ms. Ο. 11 -- or did you provide a letter to Ms. Gamba about the 12 requirements to obtain the degree of lawyer in 13 Colombia? 14 Α. Yes, I gave her a letter that was given 15 to me by the Autonomous University of Colombia. 16 Ο. And how did you obtain that document? 17 THE INTERPRETER: May the interpreter 18 instruct the witness to separate the words more 19 clearly. 2.0 THE WITNESS: I obtained the letter from 2.1 the University of Latin America -- Autonomous

THE WITNESS: I obtained the letter from the University of Latin America — Autonomous

University of Latin America when I requested that they give me all of the requirements for people who wish to become lawyers here.

25

22

23

2.4

BY MR. SANDERSON:

2.0

- Q. And the -- there are some different dollar amounts on this page. Are those in Colombian currency or in US dollars?
- A. They are Colombian. They're Colombian prices in pesos.
- Q. And did you also provide a letter stating that you are a lawyer for the -- to be included with that document from the university?
- A. Yes. Yes. Yes, I provided a letter. The letter.
- Q. And did you also provide any proof that you are a lawyer?
- A. Yes, of course. I provided my professional card and also a certificate. A certificate that can be taken out of the website of —that you can get off the website.
- MR. SANDERSON: Your Honor, we -- the last certificate was not included in this because we figured that the bar card was enough.
- 21 THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. SANDERSON: I would move to admit
 this packet of documents as the next respondent's
 exhibit.
- THE COURT: I think it's 12. Is that

right? 1 COURTROOM DEPUTY: It's 12. 3 THE COURT: Is there any objection? 4 MS. FISHER: No, Your Honor. I would 5 just like to note on the record that the translation 6 is not through a court-certified interpreter. 7 don't object. 8 THE COURT: Thank you. 12 is admitted. 9 (Respondent Exhibit No. 12 was admitted.) 10 THE COURT: Ms. Fisher, do you have any 11 cross for this witness? 12 MS. FISHER: Yes, Your Honor, briefly. 13 THE COURT: Okay. 14 MR. SANDERSON: Ms. Oquendo, the attorney 15 for Mr. Carvajal is going to ask you a few questions 16 now. 17 This is the interpreter THE INTERPRETER: 18 Is it possible for the interpreters to have speaking. 19 a copy of the document if we're going to be discussing 2.0 it? 2.1 MR. SANDERSON: Sure. 22 REBUTTAL CROSS-EXAMINATION 23 BY MS. FISHER: 2.4 Ms. Ruiz, my name is Alex Fisher. 25 you for your time today.

1 Α. My pleasure. Ms. Ruiz, are you related in any way to Ο. Ms. Paola Gamba? 3 4 No, but I've known her for many years. Α. 5 Are you dating or in a relationship with Ο. 6 any of Ms. Gamba's family members? Α. Yes. 8 Which of her family members? Ο. 9 Α. With her brother. 10 You stated earlier the requirements you Ο. 11 have provided to us to obtain an academic degree are 12 from the Autonomous University of Latin America in 13 Colombia; is that correct? 14 Α. Yes. 15 Q. Is that the university you attended for law school? 16 17 Yes, I studied at the Latin American Α. 18 University, the Autonomous University of Latin 19 America, and I graduated from there. 2.0 Q. Is that a private or a public school? 2.1 Α. It's private. 22 Q. Do you know if their requirements differ 2.3 to obtain an academic degree as a lawyer in Colombia

There are some that are generic

between a private and a public school?

Yes.

Α.

2.4

1 requirements for all universities, and there are some that are particular to the school itself. 3 Ο. Do you know if Edison Carvajal attended 4 the Autonomous University of Latin America? 5 Yes, well, he went there sometimes. 6 took classes there at times. 7 THE INTERPRETER: Excuse me. The 8 interpreter corrects the record. I saw him there 9 sometimes at the university taking classes. 10 MS. FISHER: I think that's all at this 11 time. Thank you, Ms. Ruiz. 12 THE COURT: Any redirect of Ms. Oquendo? 13 No, Your Honor. MR. SANDERSON: 14 THE COURT: Ms. Oquendo, thank you. This 15 is the judge. Thank you very much. We're finished 16 with your examination. 17 THE WITNESS: My pleasure. *****WITNESS EXCUSED**** 18 19 THE COURT: Are we in agreement, then, 2.0 that the school where Mr. Carvajal took all this legal 2.1 course work is the same school for which we have these 22 documents? 2.3 MS. FISHER: Not yet, Your Honor. 2.4 confirming that right now.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Now we're

1 going to go back and continue the rebuttal testimony 2 of the respondent. Mr. Sanderson. 3 MR. SANDERSON: Thank you, Your Honor. CONTINUED REBUTTAL DIRECT EXAMINATION 4 5 BY MR. SANDERSON: 6 Ο. Ms. Gamba, they'd asked you how well you 7 knew Ana Maria Vasquez. 8 I didn't know her very well. Α. 9 0. And where had you met her? 10 At the shopping center. When I went with Α. 11 my mom I saw her. 12 0. And where was she working? 13 Α. Selling ice creams. 14 And approximately when was that? Q. 15 Α. When my little boy was maybe two months 16 old. 17 And did you ever get to know her better? Q. 18 I knew that she was Edison's cousin 19 because Edison had told me that he had a cousin who 2.0 worked there. 2.1 Okay. Now, I want to ask you about some Ο. 22 emails that we've submitted as evidence previously. 23 Α. Okay. 2.4 Some of these emails are from 2013 and 0. 25 2014. How did you end up with those emails?

1 Α. From Mr. Edison's email who opened up his 2 email on my computer and left it open. 3 Ο. And so what did you do? 4 Α. I went through them. 5 Why is that? Ο. 6 Α. I wanted to know what he was hiding. 7 And those emails from 2013 and 2014 were 0. 8 sent from Mr. Carvajal's account to your account. How 9 did they end up being sent to your account? 10 THE INTERPRETER: What was the last part 11 of the question, Counsel? 12 BY MR. SANDERSON: 13 How did those emails end up being sent 0. 14 from his account to your account? 15 Α. I sent them. 16 And then so some of the emails that we 17 submitted were from 2016. How did you end up with 18 those emails? 19 The ones that are from 2016 were sent to Α. 2.0 me by Ms. Luz Elena Villegas. 2.1 Why were they sent to you? 0. 22 She sent them to me to confirm to me that Α. 23 she still had a relationship with Edison. 2.4 And why did she want to confirm that she 0.

had a relationship with Edison?

A. Because she realized that he was going to make a trip in December. And so she got annoyed because he told her that he didn't have anything with me.

In fact, he said to her that the only thing he was going to do was bring me my son and go back to her.

- Q. And when Ms. Villegas testified, she said that Mr. Carvajal didn't work on the weekends so that he could spend time with Thiago. And so do you recall if Mr. Carvajal ever worked on the weekend?
- A. I remember that on weekends Mr. Carvajal would be completely drunk hanging out with his friends out on somebody's property.
- Q. And before, during the day, do you know if he was going to work?
- A. The official employees only work from Monday through Friday.
 - Q. So he didn't work on the weekends?
 - A. He did not work on weekends.
- Q. Ms. Gamba, do you know what this document is?
- 23 A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

- Q. What is it?
- A. It's the house where I've always lived,

1 and here it states that it is the property of my 2 parents. 3 And how did you obtain this document? 4 These are the taxes that one pays on the Α. 5 And my mom and my stepfather sent it to me. 6 It's in both of their names. 7 MR. SANDERSON: Your Honor, I'd move to 8 admit this solely for the purpose of demonstrating the 9 parents' ownership or the mother's ownership of the 10 house. 11 THE COURT: Any objection? 12 MS. FISHER: No objection, Your Honor. 13 We'd just like to note for the record that this was 14 not translated by an official court-certified 15 interpreter. 16 THE COURT: Okay, thank you. It will be 17 received as Exhibit 13. 18 (Respondent Exhibit No. 13 was admitted.) 19 BY MR. SANDERSON: 2.0 Q. Ms. Gamba, when Mr. Carvajal left the 2.1 United States in January 2017, did he leave anything in the United States? 22

A. Yes.

23

2.4

- Q. What did he leave?
- 25 A. He left a suitcase with the things that

he had come with, his personal things, clothing and shoes with the promise of coming back.

- Q. Ms. Gamba, do you recognize this bag?
- A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

- O. What is it?
- A. That's Mr. Edison Carvajal's suitcase.
- Q. And how do you know that?
- A. It's marked that he wrote it down himself the day that he made the trip.
- Q. And inside the bag are some clothing. Do you recognize this clothing?
- A. Yes, that's some of Mr. Edison's clothing.
 - Q. Ms. Gamba, what are these photos?
 - A. These pictures are Mr. Edison Carvajal wearing that clothing that he left here in the United States.
 - Q. So in the first photo, is this -- do you think that this is the piece of clothing he's wearing?
 - A. Yes, he's wearing two jackets because it was very cold, and that's the one he was wearing underneath.
- THE COURT: And let the record reflect

 Mr. Sanderson is holding up a long-sleeved orange

 hooded sweatshirt.

BY MR. SANDERSON:

BY MR. SANDERSON:

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

- Q. And in the second photo?
- A. In the second picture it shows Mr. Edison on the porch of the home wearing that shirt.
- Q. And is that shirt that I'm holding up, do you believe that it's the same as the shirt in the second photo?
 - A. Yes, it's the same one.

THE COURT: Let the record reflect
Mr. Sanderson is holding up a dark red short-sleeved
T-shirt with a white design on the front of it.

- Q. And the third photo has a photo of Mr. Carvajal with a child on it. Do you recognize that shirt?
- A. With this T-shirt on was when he asked me for forgiveness for his infidelity with Ms. Luz Elena and asked me for a new opportunity for him to be able to start all over again with me and the baby.
- Q. And do you believe that the shirt in the third photo is the same as the shirt that I'm holding up now?
- A. It's the same one. He made it. He brought it and he left it.

THE COURT: Does it have writing on it?

```
1
                   THE WITNESS:
                                 Yes.
                   THE COURT: What does the writing say?
 3
                   THE WITNESS:
                                 It says mommy, give daddy
 4
     one last chance. He loves us very much.
 5
                   And effectively I did give him the last
 6
              And I ended up waiting for him.
 7
                                   Your Honor, I'd move to
                   MR. SANDERSON:
 8
     admit the photos of Mr. Carvajal wearing this
 9
     clothing.
10
                   THE COURT: Any objection to the photos?
11
                   MS. FISHER: No objection, Your Honor.
12
     Would just like to note on the record that there's no
13
     time or date stamp on these photos.
14
                   THE COURT: Received as Exhibit 14.
15
                   (Respondent Exhibit No. 14 was admitted.)
     BY MR. SANDERSON:
16
17
                   Ms. Gamba, I've handed you an email.
             Q.
                                                          Do
18
     you recognize this email?
19
             Α.
                   Yes.
2.0
             Ο.
                   And what is this email?
2.1
                   It's from a representative in Washington
             Α.
     of the Colombian embassy.
22
2.3
                   Is it -- it's from the -- somebody in
2.4
     Washington or it's to somebody in Washington?
25
                   I'm sending it to this gentleman who is a
             Α.
```

1 representative of the embassy in Washington. And previously an email with Mr. Okun was Q. admitted in this case. Is this a different email? 3 4 It's the same one. Α. 5 Ο. It's the same email that we submitted 6 previously? 7 I don't remember, but it's the only one Α. I've sent. 8 9 MS. FISHER: Respondent's Exhibit 8, I 10 believe. 11 THE COURT: You're talking about 12 Exhibit 8; right? 13 MR. SANDERSON: Yes, Your Honor. 14 THE WITNESS: Oh, yes, I'm sorry. It's 15 the reply to those emails. I see. 16 BY MR. SANDERSON: 17 And how did you end up -- why did you end Q. 18 up sending these emails? 19 I sent these emails so we would come to a 2.0 conciliatory agreement with Edison about him being able to see his son, which he rejected because he said 2.1 22 that what he wants is for me to go back to Colombia. 2.3 MR. SANDERSON: Your Honor, I'd move to 2.4 admit this as Respondent Exhibit 15. 25 THE COURT: Any objection?

```
MS. FISHER: None at this time,
 1
 2
     Your Honor.
 3
                   THE COURT: All right. Received.
 4
                   MS. FISHER: I'd just like to note for
 5
     the record that the translation is not by a certified
 6
     court interpreter.
 7
                   THE COURT:
                               Okay.
 8
                   (Respondent Exhibit No. 15 was admitted.)
 9
     BY MR. SANDERSON:
10
                   Ms. Gamba, when Thiago spent his first
             Ο.
11
     five months here up until January 2017, did he like it
12
     here?
13
             Α.
                         He loves being here.
                   Yes.
14
                   And when he first got here in August of
             Q.
15
     2016, did he speak at all?
16
             Α.
                   No, he didn't talk at all. He just said
17
     mama.
18
                   And when Mr. Carvajal visited
             Ο.
19
     in December 2016 to January of 2017, did Thiago speak
2.0
     at all then?
2.1
                   Yes. Yes, he was already talking.
             Α.
                   And what language did he speak?
22
             Q.
2.3
             Α.
                   In English.
2.4
                   And during his time here, did Thiago
             Ο.
25
     know -- get to know any of his family other than
```

Mr. and Mrs. Chambers? 1 Α. Yes. 3 Ο. Who else has he spent time with? 4 David's father -- parents. David's Α. 5 parents. And my son calls them his grandpas. He says 6 granny and grandpa. 7 And who does he call granny and grandpa? 8 Can you clarify? 9 Α. David's parents. 10 And has he met any of the other -- any Ο. 11 other family members in the United States? 12 Α. Yes. 13 And who else has he met? Ο. 14 David has some daughters and they have Α. 15 And, in fact, even last Sunday we were together 16 with them in a family reunion at a birthday. 17 The interpreter -- I MR. SANDERSON: 18 believe she said has brothers and sisters. 19 BY MR. SANDERSON: 2.0 Q. Ms. Gamba, does David have -- were you 2.1 talking about David's brothers and sisters or were you 22 talking about his children just now? 23 Α. All together. 2.4 But just now when you were talking, were Ο. 25 you talking about brothers --

- 1 Α. David has two brothers. They're married. 2 They have daughters. And those daughters have 3 children. So we all got together like a family to 4 share time together. 5 And how often do you see them? 0. 6 Α. A lot. Just last Sunday we were all 7 together. 8 And how often does he see his Ο. 9 grandparents? Or David's parents, excuse me. 10 Α. Every day.
 - Q. He sees David's parents every day?
 - A. Every day.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. Where do they live?
- A. Right across the street from us.
- Q. When did you first tell Mr. Carvajal that you wanted to come to the United States to live here?
- A. I told him that I wanted to come here the first time that I realized that he had a visa, and I complained to him, why hadn't he included me.
 - Q. And approximately when was that?
- A. I'm not sure. It was when Thiago was very young. I think maybe in 2014 or 2015, probably.
- Q. And once you were in the United States, did you and Mr. Carvajal discuss where Thiago was going to live?

1 Α. Yes. And what did you guys talk about? Q. That he wanted the child to live here. 3 Α. 4 Why did he want the child to live here? Q. 5 Because it was so much better than Α. 6 Colombia, education, the care and my child here, he 7 can go out, he can run around. He's spending time 8 with the family. 9 And when Thiago was still in Colombia, 10 did he spend a lot of time at Mr. Carvajal's parents' 11 house? 12 Α. No. 13 How often did he go over there? Ο. 14 Sometimes Edison would go to my house and Α. 15 ask me if I would let the child go -- if he could take 16 the child with him. But he wouldn't be gone even a 17 half hour because he would say that the baby was 18 crying. And the baby cried because he didn't know 19 them. 2.0 Q. And did you go with Thiago and 2.1 Mr. Carvajal to his parents' house? 22 Α. Never. 2.3 Q. Why not? 2.4 Ms. Elana Socorro, his mother, had

prohibited me from getting near their house.

1 Q. Why did she do that? 2 Because, according to her, I don't have Α. 3 enough studies completed to be near her son. 4 And since he's been in the United States, 5 who has taken -- since Thiago has been in the 6 United States, who's primarily taken care of him? 7 When I go to work, he stays with my Α. sister and with David. 8 9 0. And when you're not at work? 10 Α. Me. 11 Q. And does he live with you? 12 Yes, I get out of work at 1 o'clock and Α. 13 he spends the whole afternoon with me. 14 MR. SANDERSON: No more questions, 15 Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Cross? Yes, Your Honor. 17 REBUTTAL CROSS-EXAMINATION 18 BY MS. FISHER: 19 Good afternoon -- or good morning, Ο. 2.0 Ms. Gamba. MS. FISHER: Your Honor, for the Court's 2.1 22 record, we have certified interpretations of 2.3 defendant's Exhibit 9 and 11, which I provided to 2.4 defendant's counsel. If I could move these into

evidence at this time, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: These are the two exhibits 2 that contain emails between Mr. Carvajal and Ms. Luz? 3 MS. FISHER: Yes, Your Honor. 4 Okay. Any objection? THE COURT: 5 MR. SANDERSON: No objection, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: All right. So those would 7 be, what, 16, collective 16? 8 MS. FISHER: Plaintiff's 16. We can just 9 make them a collective exhibit, Your Honor, if that's 10 acceptable. 11 THE COURT: That's fine. 12 (Petitioner Exhibit No. 16 was admitted.) 13 THE INTERPRETER: May the interpreters 14 have copies if we're going to be having questions 15 about them? 16 MS. FISHER: Yes. 17 BY MS. FISHER: 18 Ms. Gamba, I'd like to hand you at this 19 time several documents that happen to be screenshots 2.0 of What's App conversations between you and Ms. Diana 2.1 Vasquez. Ms. Gamba, do these appear to be What's App 22 messages between yourself and Ms. Diana Vasquez 23 between approximately December 2017 and March 2018? 2.4 Α. Yes. 25 MS. FISHER: Your Honor, at this time I'd

```
1
     like to move these into evidence as Petitioner's
     Exhibit 17.
 3
                   THE COURT: Any objection?
 4
                   MR. SANDERSON:
                                   I haven't checked, given
 5
     that the second one seems to have no context and --
 6
     oh, they're just out of order a little?
 7
                   MS. FISHER: These are in the order that
 8
     they were provided. So the English translation is in
 9
     the same order as the Spanish screenshots that are
10
     provided directly behind them.
11
                   MR. SANDERSON: No objections,
12
     Your Honor.
13
                   THE COURT: All right. Received as
14
     Exhibit 17.
15
                   (Petitioner Exhibit No. 17 was admitted.)
     BY MS. FISHER:
16
17
                   Ms. Gamba, you are using an interpreter
             Q.
18
     here in court today; correct?
19
                   Not literally. I mean, I understand.
             Α.
2.0
             Q.
                   So why are you using an interpreter in
2.1
     court, then?
22
             Α.
                   There are some words that one doesn't
2.3
            In fact, legal ones, because, I mean, I don't
2.4
     have anything to do with the law.
25
                   And that's because you're a native
             0.
```

Spanish speaker; is that correct?

A. Yes.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

- Q. And you testified here today that you are the primary caregiver for your son Thiago since you've lived in the United States; is that right?
 - A. I said my sister because I work.
- Q. So Thiago spends most of his time with you or your sister; is that fair?
 - A. And with David.
- Q. And your sister is also a native Spanish speaker; is that right?
 - A. Yes. She speaks English and Spanish.
- Q. You and your sister mostly speak Spanish when the two of you are talking to one another; right?
 - A. We do, yes. Between her and me? Yes.
- Q. So it's fair to say that Thiago at least understands Spanish if he's spending most of his time with you or your sister Kelly?
- A. My sister at her home speaks English because David does not speak Spanish. And I speak English with my son because there are words that he doesn't understand.
- Q. The question was whether or not Thiago understands Spanish if he spends most of his time with you and your sister. Is it fair to say that Thiago

1 understands some Spanish?

A. The truth is I don't know. I speak with him in English. The fact is my mom who speaks with him through video calls is doing English classes because she speaks Spanish he doesn't understand.

THE INTERPRETER: He does not understand her.

BY MS. FISHER:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. Okay. I have some questions for you about your communications with Luz Villegas.
 - A. Go ahead.
- Q. Ms. Villegas testified to this Court in her affidavit that you contacted her in 2016 and threatened her; is that correct?
- A. That's not correct. I've never contacted her. She contacted me.
- Q. So there is an email that Ms. Villegas provided to the Court that is from you to her dated February 21, 2018, 11:26 a.m. Did you not send an email to Ms. Villegas on February 21?
- A. That is true, I was responding to an email that she sent me in December. That's how I had her information. And I -- none of it am I threatening her.
 - Q. Okay. I just asked if you sent her an

1 email. 2 MS. FISHER: Could we please pass the 3 witness Defendant's Exhibit 15. Do you have that? 4 Which should be the affidavit of Luz Elena Villegas 5 and its attachments. 6 THE COURT: Defense Exhibit 15? That's 7 the letter she sent to David Okun. 8 MS. FISHER: Sorry, petitioner's Exhibit 15. My apologies, Your Honor. 9 10 BY MS. FISHER: 11 Q. Ms. Gamba, could you please turn to what 12 will be the very last page is the version in Spanish 13 of the email from you to Luz Villegas? 14 Α. Yes. 15 If you'll look down to the third Q. 16 paragraph of the email, you write to Ms. Villegas, I 17 know that what I'm asking you for is not easy, but for 18 my child --19 THE INTERPRETER: One moment, please, 2.0 Counsel. I know it's not easy for you -- I'm sorry, 2.1 the interpreter needs you to repeat. 22 MS. FISHER: Not a problem. 2.3 apologies. BY MS. FISHER: 2.4 25 I know that what I am asking you for is 0.

not easy, but for my child I am really willing to do whatever it takes. Is that an accurate statement?

- A. Yes, I know it's difficult for her because I know that she had a relationship with Edison. When I talked to her in 2016 she swore to me on her mother's grave that if I needed anything for me to tell her.
- Q. Ms. Gamba, I have a few more questions for you. Okay?
 - A. Okay.

2.1

- Q. Your attorney earlier introduced a piece of evidence to you related to property taxes your parents paid.
- A. That's not true -- well, that's not true, we don't have --
 - THE INTERPRETER: May the interpreter make an inquiry as to the word f-i-n-c-a in Spanish. We may have different dialects of Spanish and it's used differently.

THE COURT: Okay.

- THE INTERPRETER: The interpreter would like to correct the record.
- THE WITNESS: That's not true, we don't have a country home. The property, we don't have a country property.

BY MS. FISHER:

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

- Q. That was not the question. The question was whether your attorney introduced to you earlier Respondent's Exhibit 13, which is evidence of property taxes your parents paid on their home.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. If your parents own their home and someone pays them rent, they still owe the property taxes on the home they own; correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. You were asked several questions earlier about David Chambers, your sister's husband; correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And David Chambers, his extended family, is not related to Thiago; right?
- A. They're not blood relatives, but he loves them very much.
- Q. It's fair to say that Thiago has more people who are blood relatives in Colombia than he does here in the United States; right?
- A. The blood relationship doesn't make any difference if one doesn't love the person.
- Q. That was not the question. The question was is it fair to say that Thiago has more blood relatives in Colombia than he does here in the

United States? 1 2 Α. Yes. 3 Ο. Ms. Gamba, you have previously stated 4 that you intend to file an application for political 5 asylum so you can remain in the United States; is that 6 right? 7 Α. Yes. If you know, are you seeking political 8 Ο. 9 asylum in the United States based on your race? 10 Α. No. If you know, are you seeking political 11 Q. 12 asylum based on your religion? 13 Α. No. 14 Q. If you know, are you seeking political 15 asylum based on your nationality? 16 Α. No. 17 If you know, are you seeking asylum based Q. on your political opinions? 18 19 Α. No. 2.0 Q. If you know, you're seeking asylum based 2.1 on your membership in a particular social group? 22 Α. No, I don't know. 2.3 MS. FISHER: That's all at this time, 2.4 Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Any redirect?

MR. SANDERSON: 1 Yes, Your Honor. 2 REBUTTAL REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SANDERSON: 3 Ms. Gamba, are you an attorney? 4 Q. 5 Α. No. Are you an expert in US law? 6 7 Α. That's what I had just said a few No. 8 minutes ago. I don't know anything about that. 9 0. And are you an expert in asylum law, in 10 particular? 11 Α. No. 12 0. Do you understand how an immigration 13 court case goes from the very beginning of court to a 14 final decision? 15 Α. No. Do you have an attorney for your 16 17 immigration court case? 18 Yes. Α. 19 Why do you have an attorney? Ο. 2.0 Α. Because I don't know. 2.1 Ms. Gamba, I would like to return to that Q. 22 email that you sent Ms. Luz Villegas for a moment. 2.3 Okay? 2.4 THE COURT: What exhibit is that? 25 11? Your 11 or 9?

```
1
                   MR. SANDERSON:
                                   It's hers.
 2
                   THE COURT: Is it plaintiff's
 3
     collective 16?
 4
                   MR. SANDERSON: I believe it's 15, the
 5
     affidavit of --
 6
                   THE COURT: The affidavit of Luz
 7
     Villegas?
 8
                   MR. SANDERSON:
                                   Yes.
 9
                   THE COURT: That's plaintiff's 15,
10
     petitioner's 15. Does she have it? Do you want to
11
     ask her questions about it?
12
                   MR. SANDERSON: Yes, I believe --
13
     BY MR. SANDERSON:
14
                   Do you still have that in front of you?
             Q.
15
             Α.
                   Yes.
                   And in that email in the -- it's the
16
             0.
17
     second paragraph that begins speaking about your
18
     cousin Daniel. You appear to be asking Ms. Villegas
19
     for something. Do you recollect what you -- or can
2.0
     you tell me what you were asking her?
2.1
             Α.
                   Yes.
                   What were you asking for?
22
2.3
                   I'm -- it says here I'm writing you from
             Α.
2.4
     mother to mother to ask you for all -- bottom of my
25
     heart to help me by sending me a letter that will say
```

that if you had or do have a relationship with Edison, 1 if you know his mom and his family, because they're 3 here and they are saying that they don't know you. 4 And then what did you ask her about the 5 weekends? 6 Α. He alleges that he was spending every 7 weekend with Thiago when the truth is that many of 8 them he was spending with you. 9 THE INTERPRETER: Interpreter needs to 10 make a clarification. 11 THE WITNESS: And that both of you, many 12 times, went off together on weekends. 13 BY MR. SANDERSON: And were you asking her to tell the 14 Q. 15 truth? 16 Α. Yes. 17 And why were you asking her to tell the Q. 18 truth? 19 Α. Well, because they were lying and that I 2.0 know that she could tell the truth. 2.1 MR. SANDERSON: No more questions, 22 Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Any recross? 2.4 MS. FISHER: Very brief, Your Honor. 25

1 REBUTTAL RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. FISHER: 2 3 Ο. Ms. Gamba, we're still looking at petitioner's Exhibit 15, this email dated February 21, 4 5 2018, from you to Ms. Villegas. 6 Α. Okay. 7 In the first sentence of the second Ο. 8 paragraph --9 Α. Yes. 10 0. -- you wrote you've already met another 11 person? 12 Α. Yes. 13 Are you currently dating someone? Ο. 14 Α. Yes. 15 Q. And how long have you been in that 16 relationship? 17 Α. Ten months. 18 And is that person a US citizen? Q. 19 Α. Yes. 2.0 Q. And how did you meet them? 2.1 Α. A girlfriend of mine introduced us. 22 A girlfriend of yours who lives here in Q. the United States? 2.3 2.4 Α. Yes. 25 Ms. Gamba, do you need an attorney to Ο.

1 tell you if you're being persecuted based on your race? 3 Α. No. MS. FISHER: That's all, Your Honor. 4 5 THE COURT: Anything else? 6 MR. SANDERSON: One question, Your Honor. 7 REBUTTAL REDIRECT EXAMINATION 8 BY MR. SANDERSON: 9 0. Ms. Gamba, can you tell me under US 10 asylum law what a particular social group is? 11 Α. No, I don't know what that is. 12 MR. SANDERSON: No more questions, 13 Your Honor. 14 MS. FISHER: No recross, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Ms. Gamba, you must have some 16 sense of how you are applying for political asylum. 17 Initially I was going to THE WITNESS: 18 ask for political asylum with Edison. And he's the 19 one who's involved in all of the criminal law and 2.0 information. I'm here already and he didn't want to 2.1 do this with me. So through my attorney we're going 22 to do it for domestic violence that he caused me. 2.3 THE COURT: When you were going to apply 2.4 for political asylum with Edison, what was the basis 25 for that? What did you talk about?

1 THE WITNESS: He told me that Ms. Luz 2 Elena's husband was a corrupt attorney, and because of 3 the fact that he had had that relationship with her, 4 they were going to kill the whole bunch of us. 5 THE COURT: And was this -- when you say 6 they, you mean Luz's husband had a gang or a group of 7 people that were going to do this killing? 8 THE WITNESS: Edison referred to him to 9 Luz's husband as the head of a group of delinquents 10 called La oficina, the office. 11 THE COURT: You mean criminals. Not 12 delinquents, but criminals? 13 THE WITNESS: Criminals. 14 THE COURT: So the plan was that you and 15 Edison would claim political asylum? 16 THE WITNESS: Yes. 17 THE COURT: Because this group, 18 La oficina, had plans to kill you and Edison and your 19 child because of the affair? 2.0 THE WITNESS: Yes. 2.1 THE COURT: Okay. But now your 22 application for political asylum is based upon 23 domestic violence against you by Edison? 2.4 THE WITNESS: Yes. 25 THE COURT: Anything else?

1 MS. FISHER: I have a brief recross, 2 Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: All right, go ahead. 4 Thank you. MS. FISHER: 5 REBUTTAL RECROSS-EXAMINATION 6 BY MS. FISHER: 7 Ms. Gamba, why do you think Edison 0. 8 remained in Colombia if he is in such danger? 9 I think that he is -- he was laying a 10 trap for me. 11 Q. How do you think he has escaped harm for 12 over a year in Colombia? 13 I don't know, really. I don't. 14 MS. FISHER: That's all. Thank you. 15 THE COURT: Was this plan to claim 16 political asylum based on this La oficina, was this a 17 real threat, do you think, or is this just something 18 you and Edison were going to claim was a threat? 19 THE WITNESS: No, it's something real. 2.0 And I didn't say that Ms. Luz Elena called me in 2.1 December of 2014 when my son was two months old. 22 said -- she's married and she said, my husband's a 2.3 very dangerous person and I'm going to have him kill 2.4 you and your child. I really got scared. And Edison 25

was even more so than I was, so much so that he went

```
1
     and hid out for two months.
                   THE COURT: Okay. You may step down.
 3
                   THE WITNESS: I can go?
 4
                   THE COURT: Yes.
 5
                                 Thank you (in English.)
                   THE WITNESS:
                    *****WITNESS EXCUSED****
 6
 7
                   THE COURT: All right. Any more rebuttal
 8
     from the respondent?
 9
                   MR. SANDERSON:
                                   No, Your Honor.
10
                   THE COURT: Any surrebuttal?
11
                   MS. FISHER: Yes, Your Honor. Mr. Edison
12
     Carvajal.
13
                   THE COURT: Mr. Carvajal, you're still
14
     under oath from earlier today. Are you there?
15
                   THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm here.
                  SURREBUTTAL DIRECT EXAMINATION
16
17
     BY MS. FISHER:
18
                  Mr. Carvajal, have you had a chance to
19
     look at what has been introduced today as the
2.0
     administrative requirements to obtain an academic
     title?
2.1
22
                   Yes, I know them.
            Α.
2.3
                   MS. FISHER: Your Honor, for the
2.4
     interpreter, could we please hand the interpreter what
25
     is Respondent's Exhibit 12.
```

BY MS. FISHER:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

2.4

- Q. Mr. Carvajal, what university did you attend for your law school?
 - A. The Autonomous University of Latin America.
 - Q. And Mr. Carvajal, have you had a chance to look at the Spanish version of the requirements to obtain an academic degree that are purportedly for your university?
- A. I know that document very well, so I haven't had to review it.
- Q. Okay. Mr. Carvajal, have you completed your plan of study?
 - A. Yes, I finished all my studies. The only thing that's left to do is to finish with the graduation ceremony and all of the official administrative processes that have to be undergone.
 - Q. Okay. Mr. Carvajal, did you -- I'm going to ask you a different question now. Did you leave behind some items of clothing accidentally when you traveled back to Colombia from the US?

THE INTERPRETER: I couldn't hear.

23 BY MS. FISHER:

- Q. Please repeat.
- 25 A. Yes, and I'll explain why I left them. I

left them there because Paola's sister Kelly wanted to send some presents back to the family in Colombia.

And the suitcase that I had taken with me when I traveled — because I never did intend to stay — was a very small — it was a very small suitcase, only enough for personal items.

O. Mr. --

A. So Kelly told me that she wanted me to take some presents for her family members. And it's quite numerous, her family. There's four people, and so that I could leave some other things behind in order to fit those in.

- Q. Mr. Carvajal, did you --
- A. And that I could take a suitcase that she had that was bigger so that all the family's gifts would fit in it. That's the reason why I left that's the reason why I left some of my own items behind.
- Q. Mr. Carvajal, did Ms. Luz Villegas's husband ever threaten you or Ms. Gamba?
- A. Never. That never happened.

 MS. FISHER: That's all at this time,

 Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any cross?

2.0

2.1

SURREBUTTAL CROSS-EXAMINATION

2 BY MR. SANDERSON:

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

- Q. Mr. Carvajal, this is Joel Sanderson, the attorney for Ms. Gamba. I just have a few questions.
 - A. Hello, sir. How are you?
- Q. I'm doing well. So I want to ask you about what you said about Paola's sister Kelly.
 - A. Okay, of course.
- Q. Were you planning on getting the clothing that you left in the United States back?
- A. No, she told me that she would bring it to me when she brought my son to me.
- Q. And with regard to Luz Elena Villegas, did you ever have a romantic or sexual relationship with Ms. Villegas?
 - A. Well --

THE INTERPRETER: The interpreter wishes to say that the first part of the sentence is missing, so she's going to inquire about that, but in the meanwhile she'll say what was the second part before she forgets it.

THE WITNESS: But it didn't work out and that was in 2013, and that was before my son was born.

Yes, of course, I'll repeat it. In 2013

I went out with her a few times. And when things

didn't work out between us, we remained good friends.

She already had her family. And that was before my

son Thiago was born.

BY MR. SANDERSON:

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

- Q. Mr. Carvajal, previously when you testified you had said that, no, you'd never had any sort of relationship like that with Ms. Villegas.

 Isn't that right?
- A. No, I'm clarifying. I haven't had -- I haven't had a -- I haven't had a -- I haven't had a relationship with her in the sense that I only went out with her a couple of times. I wouldn't exactly call that a relationship's because there wasn't really a relationship. We just went out to eat and to have something to drink. We tried to get to know one another. But things didn't work.

THE COURT: Ask another question. The transcript will reveal what he said the first time around.

MR. SANDERSON: I have no more questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Carvajal, this is the judge. Did you ever have a conversation with Paola where you discussed seeking political asylum in the United States together?

```
1
                   THE WITNESS: That's false -- Your Honor,
 2
     that is false.
 3
                   THE COURT: Did you ever have a
 4
     conversation with Paola about her and Thiago seeking
 5
     political asylum in the United States?
 6
                   THE WITNESS: Your Honor, that is untrue,
 7
     and I never did that, Your Honor.
 8
                   THE COURT: Mr. Carvajal, what is
     La oficina?
 9
10
                   THE WITNESS:
                                 To tell you the truth, I
11
     don't really know what Ms. Paola is referring to when
12
     she uses that term. I'm -- I do not know about that.
13
                   THE COURT: Do you know if Ms. Luz's
14
     husband is a member of any kind of a group or gang?
15
                   THE WITNESS:
                                 That's untrue because I've
16
     been work -- a coworker with Luz Villegas. She tells
17
     me that her husband is a lawyer.
18
                   THE INTERPRETER: The interpreter thinks
19
     we've gotten cut off.
2.0
                   THE COURT: Are you still there,
2.1
     Mr. Carvajal? Mr. Carvajal, are you still on the
22
     phone?
23
                   Are you in touch with him, Ms. Fisher?
2.4
                  MS. FISHER: I just messaged him,
25
     Your Honor. It looks like there's still one person
```

1 logged in on the call. Usually it makes a little beep 2 if it drops off. If you'll give me 20 seconds, I'll confirm if he's still on. 3 4 THE COURT: Okay. 5 Mr. Carvajal, are you on the phone? 6 THE WITNESS: I'm here. 7 THE COURT: Okay. You were saying that 8 Ms. Luz told you that her husband was a lawyer, and 9 then you were cut off. So can you finish your answer? 10 THE WITNESS: Of course, with pleasure. 11 I was saying to you, Your Honor, and to the Court that 12 Luz Villegas told me that her husband is an attorney 13 and she also is an attorney, and at this point in time 14 he is in public office. He teaches classes at the 15 university. That's what she told me. I have no 16 personal knowledge of this because I'm not in touch 17 with him. 18 Okay, thank you. All right. THE COURT: 19 I think we're finished -- we're finished with 2.0 testimony. Is there any other surrebuttal from the 2.1 petitioner? 22 MS. FISHER: Nothing further, Your Honor. 2.3 THE COURT: Any surrebuttal from the 2.4 respondent? 25 MR. SANDERSON: No, Your Honor.

```
1
                   THE COURT: All right. Would you like to
 2
     make closing arguments?
 3
                   MS. FISHER: Yes, Your Honor.
 4
                   THE COURT: We're going to take a
 5
     15-minute recess and we'll come back for closing
 6
     arguments.
 7
                   (Whereupon, a break was taken from
 8
     11:35 a.m. to 11:53 a.m.)
 9
                   THE COURT: All right. I'm ready for
10
     argument, Ms. Fisher.
11
                  MS. FISHER:
                                Thank you, Your Honor, for
12
     the time and attention you've given to this case.
13
                              Well, thank you. Because I
                   THE COURT:
14
     know you're probably doing this pro bono, am I right?
15
                  MS. FISHER: Yes, Your Honor.
16
                   Just briefly, in closing, as you've heard
17
     over the past few days, Mr. Carvajal never consented
18
     to the retention of his son permanently in the
19
     United States. His decision to trust that
2.0
     Ms. Chambers would return Thiago to Colombia was not
2.1
     consent. It was simply his decision to trust
22
     Ms. Chambers.
2.3
                   Your Honor, I'd like to bring your
2.4
     attention to a case which I provided a copy of to
25
     opposing counsel for some guidance in this matter.
```

1 Koc versus Koc, I believe. K-o-c versus K-o-c. And I 2 have a copy for Your Honor today. 3 THE COURT: What circuit is it? 4 MS. FISHER: Eastern District of 5 New York. 6 THE COURT: Okay. 2001. 7 MS. FISHER: Yes, Your Honor. And this 8 case establishes several factors to look at to 9 determine if a child is well-settled in the new 10 country that they've been brought to. And I think it 11 provides some relevance for us here today. 12 It looks to the child's age, the 13 stability of residence in their new environment, and 14 in particular when looking at stability, the Court 15 looks on page 154 to the immigration status of the 16 child and the immigration status of the child's 17 parents in the new country as to whether or not that's 18 certain or uncertain. 19 THE COURT: Now, this child was seven 2.0 years old. 2.1 MS. FISHER: Yes, Your Honor. And this 22 case the child had been retained in the United States 23 for a two and a half years.

This court also looks to whether or not the child is attending school, which Thiago is not.

2.4

Looks to whether they're attending church or religious services, which we've heard no testimony to; the stability of the abducting parent's employment; and whether they have friend or relatives in the area.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

In looking at these sort of comprehensive factors that the Koc court looked at in 2001, none of those have been established in this case. So we know Mr. Carvajal did not consent for his son Thiago to be here, and he has not proved that he is well-settled under the case law in prior cases similar to this.

As Your Honor well knows, this is not a domestic case in state court. This is a case about which jurisdiction is the appropriate venue to determine questions about the division of custody between Thiago's parents.

So I'd just like to be very clear on the record that Mr. Carvajal is not attempting to, nor does he wish to separate Thiago from Thiago's mother. Rather, the purpose of the Hague Convention and its application and situation such as these, and specifically the purpose of Mr. Carvajal's petition under the Hague Convention, is to ensure that Thiago has the opportunity to have a relationship with both his mother and father.

That if he is to change his residence to

a different country, that it is with the consent of both parents, not a unilateral decision by one parent.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

Just logistically, Your Honor, so you know regarding the priority of Thiago in this case, our office has been in touch with the US Central Authority to coordinate a safe return protocol with the US Department of State if Your Honor determines that Thiago is to return to Colombia.

We've also retained a psychologist,

Debora DeSwano, to assist Thiago in this transition.

And Your Honor, she was an individual present in the court at the first two hearings.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. FISHER: Thiago has a valid passport, which is in this Court's possession. Mr. Carvajal has a valid tourism visa that will permit him to return to the United States to escort Thiago home.

Currently, Your Honor, the civil courts are closed in Colombia between Palm Sunday and Easter, and he is widely available until April 1, and beyond April 1 he is still available to return and can coordinate with family to ensure that, again, if Your Honor chooses — or determines that Thiago is to appropriately return to Colombia, we've made every effort to make sure that that transition is in

Thiago's best interest and to facilitate it for him.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

Just in conclusion, Your Honor, this case is about a minor child, that he deserves the opportunity to grow up having a relationship with both parents. He is very fortunate, unlike many children, that he has a mother and a father who desperately want to have a relationship with him. We simply request that Your Honor, in looking at the Hague Convention guidelines, permit that to happen. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Fisher.

Mr. Sanderson.

MR. SANDERSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, this is not a Hague

Convention case because Thiago's habitual residence is

the United States, and the petitioner has not

established by the preponderance of evidence the

prima facie case that habitual residence is Colombia

and that is his burden.

Now, it may be that the petitioner regrets some of his decisions and actions and regrets initially intending for the US to be Thiago's home.

But this Court isn't here to fix those problems.

Now, there are two tests for habitual residence which seem like they can be used separately and in conjunction, the acclimatization test and the

settled mutual intent.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

Now, under either one the respondent has demonstrated, though it's not her initial burden, but has demonstrated that the preponderance of the evidence establishes that the habitual residence is the United States.

Now, Mr. Carvajal did intend from sometime around at least July 2016 until sometime around February 2017, for Thiago's home to become the United States. And in addition to petitioner's other burden, one of them is to establish the actual date and time period of wrongful retention, and so far it's unclear whether it's early February, mid February, March, like where that line actually is.

But the question for habitual residence does -- is based on the habitual residence at the time of whenever that retention was.

Now, the evidence in this case is consistent with Ms. Gamba's testimony and the evidence that she has presented. In addition, her version of events is also consistent with the evidence submitted by the petitioner.

I would direct the Court, for example, to the emails that she sent to the Department of State.

They are basically the exact same thing that she

testified to in court. She's not had a different story; whereas, Mr. Carvajal has had different stories. And his credibility is greatly diminished by the numerous inconsistencies within his own story, as well as the inconsistency between him and basically all of his witnesses, from Diana Vasquez stating that everyone knew that Ms. Gamba wanted to move to the United States, and Ana Maria Vasquez testifying that Thiago slept half of every week at the Carvajal's house.

2.0

2.1

2.4

Then the Western Union money orders and the clothes he left in the United States and the emails with Luz Villegas, all of these demonstrate that he has not been presenting an honest and true version of the facts; whereas, the Western Union, the clothes and the other evidence and the fact that there was no flight purchased for Thiago to fly back in January.

So Mr. Carvajal, who did not have the 200 or so dollars necessary to graduate, was planning to buy a last-minute ticket around the holiday season for Thiago to return, changed his mind and then was going to buy a last-minute ticket in February for him to return.

That argument just doesn't hold water,

and it isn't consistent with the facts of this case. Moreover, Thiago is and was acclimatized to the United States. His family was here, he was comfortable here. He had been spending all of his time at home here. And to him, at that point in his life at just over two years old, you know, his home was where his mother was. She was the person who cared for him.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

Additionally, he learned to speak English as his primary language and was already learning it when Mr. Carvajal visited in December 2016. This shows that under either the settled mutual intent test, the acclimatization test or the consideration of the two of them together, this all establishes that the habitual residence is the United States and Mr. Carvajal has not carried his burden to prove by the preponderance of the evidence otherwise.

And then as far as the well-settled issue that the petitioner raised, we are not arguing the well-settled defense. It requires a one-year. And since we don't have a date of retention, it would be very difficult for us to prove that he'd already been here for a year in order for that to apply.

But we are arguing that Mr. Carvajal consented to this move; that he brought his son here

and just dropped him off; that he left his clothes and he gave away Ms. Gamba's and Thiago's clothes, which is not something you do if you're expecting them to come back.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

Now, petitioner need not relinquish his custody rights in order to consent to a permanent move. Additionally, in their briefs they focused a lot on his intention for what he was going to do for himself.

This case is not about where Mr. Carvajal intended himself to live. This case is about where Thiago was going to live. And the cases for both habitual residence and consent show that the -- that six months is plenty of time to acclimatize for both the intent and for consent that the -- the aggregation of those facts and once the move is made, that that is enough to establish them. In particular, I would point the Court to Feder versus Evans Feder, which is from the Third Circuit.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, which case?

MR. SANDERSON: Feder.

THE COURT: How do you spell it?

MR. SANDERSON: F-e-d-e-r v Evans,

E-v-a-n-s, Feder, and that's 63 F.3d 217 at page 224.

And that's the Third Circuit from 1995. And there the

Third Circuit specifically rejected the argument, this was with shared intent, but that intent can be contingent on whether the married couple in that case stayed together. And there the fact that the mother believed that she was going to leave a foreign country if her marriage did not improve did not void the couple's settled purpose as far as the child.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.4

So whether settled intent or in consent, the place for Thiago to live and have his custody case is here. This is the appropriate venue,
United States, the appropriate venue for him to -- you know, for Mr. Carvajal and Ms. Gamba to contest the custody rights because this was the intended home.

And once Thiago came to the United States, he crossed the line where there was settled mutual intent and then there was action. And the combined effect makes this his home.

Given that this is Thiago's home, has been Thiago's home and the facts show that the respondent has been consistent in her testimony whereas, Mr. Carvajal has not provided a credible version of events, simply a variety of versions of events from which the Court can choose from, the respondent requests that the Court determine that the habitual residence for Thiago is the United States.

1 THE COURT: Thank you. Any brief 2 rebuttal? You don't have to rebut. 3 MS. FISHER: No, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Okay. 5 I think we've said all that MS. FISHER: 6 we need to say by this point. 7 THE COURT: Okay. I think you have too. 8 I'm going to ask you to go through the 9 exhibits with Ms. Sawyer and make sure that they are 10 all here and that you haven't inadvertently left them 11 up here or taken them back to your desks. So I'm 12 going to ask you before you leave to make sure that 13 she's got all of the exhibits. 14 Thank you. I know -- Mr. Sanderson, I 15 think you're doing this pro bono too, aren't you? MR. SANDERSON: A little bit for the 16 17 immigration case. 18 Okay. At any rate, you both THE COURT: 19 have put your heart and souls into it. It's a very 2.0 difficult case, it's a very sad case, but I want to 2.1 thank you both for your good advocacy and all the time 22 that you have put in in presenting your side to the 23 Court. 2.4 And we will try to make a decision 25 promptly. But I do feel that I need to write an

opinion in this case, and we will get that done as soon as we can. All right. We're in recess. (Which were all of the proceedings had in the above-captioned cause on the above-captioned date.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE PAGE

I, Roxann Harkins, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, in Nashville, do hereby certify:

That I reported on the stenographic machine the proceedings held in open court on March 27, 2018, in the matter of EDISON ALBERTO CARVAJAL VASQUEZ v. PAOLA ANDREA GAMBA ACEVEDO, Case No. 3:18-cv-0137; that said proceedings were reduced to typewritten form by me; and that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate transcript of said proceedings.

This is the 12th day of July, 2018.

2.3

2.4